



**DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – January 20, 2006**

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Anna Fan, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Barbara Todd, Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Syed Ali, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Dave Whitmer, County Agriculture Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACSA)
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
Barry Wilson, University of California Department of Environmental Toxicology (UCD)
Ray Chavira, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Reg. 9 (USEPA)
Rebecca Sisco, University of California IR-4 Program
Martha Harnly, Department of Health Services (DHS-EHIB)
Tobi Jones, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

Visitors in Attendance:

Denise Webster, DPR
Steve Rhodes, DPR
Mark Rentz, DPR
Eileen Mahoney, DPR
Rachel Kubiak, DPR
Sherry Heins, AgraQuest, Inc.
Ralph Riggs, AgraQuest, Inc.
Brian Bret, Dow Agro Sciences
John Inouye, DPR
Kevin Keefer, Western Plant Health Association (WPHA)
Artie Lawyer, Technical Sciences Group (TSG)
John Pearson, Compliance Services
Anne Katten, CRLAF
Patricia Gouveia, SWRCB
Dave Tamayo, CASQA

1. Introductions and Committee Business - Tobi Jones, Chairperson

- a. About 25 people attended the meeting.
- b. There were corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on November 18, 2005.



2. Goals and Activities of the Urban Pesticide Committee – Thomas Mumley, San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board

Thomas Mumley, Planning and TMDL Division Chief, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, gave a presentation on the Urban Pesticide Committee (UPC) and Urban Pesticide and Water Quality Issues.

He provided an overview of adverse water quality impacts associated with pesticides used in urban areas in the 1990s, demonstrated by linking toxicity in creeks to diazinon and chlorpyrifos in urban runoff. Municipal wastewater treatment systems have also experienced pesticide water quality problems. He noted that at least half of California pesticide use is in urban areas, and that urban pesticide uses and regulation differ from agriculture. They include different use patterns such as applications on pavement, different regulatory approval and reporting requirements, little oversight of homeowner uses, and label-consistent uses can account for problems. Urban pesticide water quality issues have also evolved. Previously, diazinon used around buildings and in yards caused toxicity in creeks; pyrethroids used around buildings and in yards are now causing toxicity in creeks. Chlorpyrifos (pet shampoos are one possible source) caused toxicity in sewage treatment plant effluent; now permethrin-treated clothing could lead to sewage treatment plant permit violations. Also, municipalities that have water quality permit compliance challenges due to pesticides, but federal and California pesticide laws withhold regulatory authority from municipalities.

The UPC was formed in 1995 to address surface water toxicity from urban pesticide use. Participants include Water Boards, Department of Pesticide Regulation, US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), municipal urban runoff agencies, wastewater agencies, agricultural commissioners, industry representatives, and technical experts. Its mission is to resolve urban pesticide water quality issues without converting an urban runoff problem into a wastewater problem and to not solve one pesticide problem by creating another. It is the only forum of its kind in the US and now has statewide participation. The forum includes information sharing relating to urban pesticide use and water quality and coordination of participant actions. Current projects include point-of-purchase retail outreach, Integrated Pest Management (IPM) standards for structural pest control, pilot IPM certification program for structural pest control, and the UP3 Project.

The UP3 Project provides scientific and organizational support to the UPC, the water boards, and municipalities. It tracks urban pesticide uses trends, provides the latest water quality science and monitoring for use in pesticide agency regulatory activities, and fosters effective education and outreach by municipalities. It maintains an informative web site at www.up3project.org.

Tom concluded by suggesting how the PREC can help. These included keeping water quality in mind when advising DPR and the high cost of Clean Water Act non-compliance by

helping identify possible threats to water quality and specific, cost-effective measures capable of preventing problems. He pointed out that outreach alone can't solve water quality problems. Cost/feasibility issues make outreach and education an important activity, but not the main solution to urban pesticide water quality problems. Studies show outreach can achieve 10-20% behavior change *at most*, while we need > 90% reduction in pyrethroid discharges to eliminate toxicity in urban creek sediments. He suggested that the PREC could support and encourage DPR efforts to address water quality such as review of urban pesticide products and uses for water quality implications in registration and help bridge gaps left by USEPA's registration reviews.

3. Update on the VOC Inventory – Randy Segawa, DPR Environmental Monitoring Branch

Last year, DPR initiated two reevaluations pertaining to volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The first reevaluation requested that registrants provide thermogravimetric analysis data for approximately 800 products. This data will provide more accurate VOC emission estimates. The second reevaluation requested that registrants reformulate certain products so that the VOC content does not exceed 20%.

In conjunction with the first reevaluation, DPR proposes to implement modifications for the upcoming 2006 update of the 1990 - 2004 annual pesticide volatile VOC inventories. The target date for release of the 2006 update is Spring 2006. The proposed modifications include:

*Changes to the PUR application sites included and excluded from the VOC inventory.

*Development and refinement of criteria used to identify and exclude consumer products from the inventory.

*Development of default emission potentials for products containing sodium tetrathiocarbonate.

In addition, DPR proposes two planned future changes. These are annual re-calculation and update of formulation code-based default EPs, and incorporation of field emission adjustment factors in VOC emission calculations.

Lynn Baker commented that ARB supports the proposed changes.

4. 21st Century Pest Management Project: Status of Report- Mark Rentz, DPR Executive Office

Mark Rentz, DPR Deputy Director for Policy Coordination, provided the PREC with an update of the Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) and its Pest Management in the 21st Century Working Group.

Mr. Rentz informed the PREC that the working group had completed its charge, which was to identify key issues DPR is likely to be challenged with over the next 10-15 years and possible strategic recommendations to address those challenges. The working group has submitted its recommendations to the PMAC. The Director retired the working group upon submission of its recommendations. The PMAC members are currently reviewing the recommendations and will provide comments to Mr. Rentz no later than Friday, February 10. Mr. Rentz will compile the comments and distribute them to the PMAC. The PMAC will take final action on the recommendations (approval or dismissal in whole or part) at its next committee meeting which is scheduled for Friday, March 24, beginning at 10 am at the Sierra Hearing Room, Cal/EPA Building.

While Mr. Rentz did not provide a copy of his recommendations, he did provide a copy of his notes to the PMAC summarizing the last PMAC meeting when the working group recommendations were submitted and discussed. In summary, the working group identified two key areas with opportunities for DPR to proactively address key issues it is likely to encounter in the next 10-15 years: (1) Expanding DPR's Integrated Pest Management program; and (2) Enhancing DPR's Compliance, Education and Enforcement programs. The working group also recognized that a great degree of the challenges for DPR in the next 10-15 years will likely result from the rapidly expanding urban/residential areas and the subsequent urban/residential-agricultural interface.

5. Status of Certain New Active Ingredients-Steve Rhodes, DPR Registration Branch

Steve Rhodes gave an update to the PREC on January 20, 2006, regarding two new active ingredients, Aminopyralid and Iodomethane. The update included the submission dates, use sites, target pests and the current status of where the new active ingredients are in the evaluation process.

6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting– Tobi Jones, DPR

The next meeting will be held on Friday, March 17, 2006 in the Sierra Hearing Room located on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building.

7. Closing Comments – Tobi Jones

The meeting was adjourned.